

DRAFT
Technical Issues Committee (TIC)
Meeting Notes
11 July 2006

Attendees:

Joe McGahan, Summers Engineering
Dania Huggins, Central Valley Water Board
Dave Ceppos, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)
Melissa Morris, Central Valley Water Board
Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk
Susan Fregien, Central Valley Water Board
John Swanson, Central Valley Water Board
Don Weston, UC Berkeley
Roberta Firoved, California Rice Commission
Lenwood Hall, University of Maryland
Jim Atherstone, South San Joaquin Irrigation District
Jody Edmund, URS Corporation
Dan Waligora, CA Department of Fish and Game
Claus Suverkropp, Larry Walker and Associates
Maryam Khosravifard, CA Department of Food and Agriculture
Margie Lopez Read, Central Valley Water Board
Wendy Cohen, Central Valley Water board

Current Action Items

1. The Sediment Focus Group Recommendation #2, regarding frequency and timing of sediment toxicity samples needs some additional language and to be re-evaluated by the Focus Group and brought back to the TIC at the 8 August meeting.
2. The Triggers Focus group is continuing to work on recommendations for Assessment Completeness (Recommendation #6), and on the Options Table, and will work on developing a recommendation for follow-up after laboratory failed tests
3. The Triggers Focus Group Recommendation for flow and load requirements will be modified and considered for final consensus at the 8 August meeting.
4. The CVRWQCB staff will solicit comments from various programs at the CVRWQCB regarding Triggers Focus Group Recommendation 5, and for Sediment Toxicity Focus Group Recommendation #2. These will be presented at the 8 August 2006 meeting, if possible.
5. The Laboratory Round Table Focus Group will continue to develop refine language to recommendations to present at the 8 August 2006 meeting.

Meeting Summary

- I. Critical Path:** There was a brief review of the critical path, both for timing and for topic changes. The original discussion about topics of interest included items such as ‘submittal of raw data’, ‘signatory responsibility’, timing of report submittals’, ‘options for aerial photographs’, and ‘electronic data submittal’. Because these are not technical issues, they will no longer be discussed in the TIC meetings with respect to MRP recommendation development. The Critical Path has been adjusted to make note of this fact.

There was also a discussion about the timing of the Critical Path, and a reminder about the two-step process for reaching consensus on recommendations for the MRP. Based on this two-meeting process and that some items still remain to be presented, as well as the fact that the Board wants the Tentative MRP to be brought to them for approval (which necessitates a 30-day public comment period) it will be December 2006 before the Tentative MRP can be finalized. There was some discussion about the feasibility of accelerating the process, and no alternatives were identified.

- II. Triggers Focus Group Recommendation #5.** Stephen Clark led the discussion regarding Focus Group Recommendation #5 for source identification as a follow-up to toxicity test results was considered. The TIC members agreed that it should be forwarded to the Central Valley Water Board staff as a TIC recommendation.
- III. Triggers Focus Group Recommendation on Flow & Load (#6).** Lenwood Hall presented the TIC Recommendation #6 regarding Flow and Load measurements for the MRP monitoring locations. There was discussion regarding an evaluation of flow data that was prepared by Mike Johnson from UCDavis. The data indicate that USGS is the preferred method for flow-calculations, and that any method that is less rigorous is less precise. The data also indicate that all of the modified procedures resulted in flow values that were biased on the low side – which would indicate that any subsequent load calculations would be low. There was some discussion regarding minor changes to the Recommendation #6, which will be considered for consensus at the 8 August 2006 meeting.
- IV. Triggers Focus Group recommendation on Assessment Completeness.** Mike Johnson from UCDavis is working on the draft language to address this particular topic. Additional work on the Options Table is also critical to this particular recommendation. The issue will be discussed more by the Focus Group before the August meeting, with the intent of having a recommendation ready for discussion on 8 August, and for consideration of consensus on 12 September.
- V. Sediment Toxicity Focus Group Recommendation #2.** There was some discussion about the focus group recommendation regarding timing and frequency of sediment toxicity sampling. Discussion included minor language additions to the recommendation, such as the need for collecting grain size samples and collection of proper type of sediment. This recommendation could be ready for consideration of consensus at the 8 August meeting.
- VI. Laboratory Round Table Focus Group Recommendations.**

LAB RT RECOMMENDATION #1 on Performance Based Methods – The recommendation regarding Performance Based Procedures was discussed at the TIC meeting. It will be considered for consensus at the 8 August meeting, although it was felt that there needed to be an expanded list of approved methods provided before that time. For example, the Standard Methods, USGS procedures and ASTM procedures need to be referenced as well. This recommendation could be ready for consideration of consensus at the 8 August meeting.

LAB RT RECOMMENDATION #2 – Field Duplicates Bacteriological Samples. There was some confusion regarding the language in this recommendation. Some of the language, such as MS/MSD was not applicable to bacteriological samples, and it was not clear if the Focus Group intended to address issues related to field duplicates for all analyses, or only for Bacteriological Analyses. The recommendation will need to be relanguaged and brought to the TIC for discussion at the 8 August 2006 meeting and for consideration of consensus at the 19 September meeting

LAB RT RECOMMENDATION #3 – Method Blanks. This recommendation dealt with laboratory follow-up for instances where lab contamination occurs in laboratory method blanks. The TIC had some concerns about the recommendation, and the item will be taken back to the Focus Group for re-working if it is still felt to be important for the MRP QAPP recommendation. The Item could be re-presented at the 8 August meeting and considered for consensus at the 19 September meeting.

LAB RT RECOMMENDATION #4 – Addition of Fenpropathrin and for additional methods for sediment TOC to Table 1. There was some discussion about the recommendation to include a method for the TOC which was actually for Total Organic Matter, and not the appropriate analysis. This item will also require some moderate language modifications, and could possibly be considered for consensus at the 19 September meeting.

VII. Feedback on Issues related to Failed Tests and Follow-up. Stephen Clark led this discussion regarding the issues that coalitions, laboratories and consultants face when there are problems at the laboratory with tests that have been conducted. EPA has documents that state that with any failed tests, there must be resampling, which does work for point source discharges, but is difficult in the non point source multi-sampling site arena. Some of the issues included:

Cost of re-sampling

Feasibility/difficulty of comparing the result to the original sample set

Alternative of re-testing the same sample and contaminant degradation

Possibility of doing more sampling toward the end of a sample season as an alternative

The development of thresholds (triggers) for when resampling or retesting should occur

Should develop a decision tree to work through the approaches

Could use the 'Completeness' criterion in the QAPP to address this issue

VIII. Preliminary Staff Comments on TIC Recommendations

The Preliminary Staff comments were discussed with the attending committee members, and the reminder was made that these comments did not reflect Central Valley Water Board staff acceptance, nor did it reflect Central Valley Water Board staff rejection of the recommendations. It was discussed that that would need to be further vetted through the development of the Tentative MRP, and through legal review.

Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be held on **8 August 2006**. Please note that the September meeting will be held on the third Tuesday of the month, or **19 September** in order to avoid conflicts with the ACS Meeting on Pyrethroids in San Francisco. It is anticipated that the remaining recommendations can be covered in August in a 9:00 to 3:30 schedule.

STATUS of Previous Action Items

1. TIC Members will develop alternative language to address concerns expressed about the Tentative MRP, page 8, last paragraph on Management Practices implementation. *(Item from February meeting – no recommendations received; no action has taken place)*
2. The SWAMP program will work with the Irrigated Lands Coalitions to 1) develop a crosswalk between ToxCalc and SWAMP, 2) provide training for utilizing the database, QAPP development, and 3) to solicit constructive comments and suggested changes for modifications that can be made to the database. *(Margie Lopez Read will communicate with Val Connor regarding the status of the crosswalk and training opportunities. No comments or suggestions received to date)*
3. TIC members wish to work on re-wording the ILP QAPP so that it is better coordinated with the SWAMP QAPP. A focus group (laboratory?) discussion for this will be arranged. *(Staff prepared a comparison table between the two QAPPs, and this was presented at the 9 May 2006 TIC meeting)*
4. TIC members are going to provide comment on the studies that are used to provide numeric interpretation of narrative quality objectives. The appropriate focus group may be the Triggers Focus Group. *(This was discussed at the 9 May 2006 meeting, and at the 13 June meeting)*
5. The Triggers group will continue to expand upon and improve the Options Table for storm water that was presented, and to draft up Problem Statements and language for a recommendation. *(no additional information has been submitted by members of the Focus Group)*
6. Language in the Tentative MRP will need to be clarified by staff so that the submittal of data for the ILP is consistent with SWAMP requirements. *(to be added by Staff with next version of a tentative MRP)*

7. Stephen Clark of Pacific EcoRisk, and Sandy Nurse of Sierra Foothill Labs will work on developing cost-estimates for a laboratory to submit electronic data in a SWAMP comparable format. *This was completed and presented at the 13 June 2006 meeting.*
8. Water Board staff will organize a presentation by Fish and Game regarding the Bioassessment project in Central Valley agriculture lands. *(This is tentatively postponed until the MRP recommendation process can be completed.)*
9. CCP will provide recommendations to staff about comment tracking protocols and methods to enhance readability of subsequent MRP recommendations/revisions from the TIC and Staff. *(to take place in near future)*
10. Staff and the TIC will further discuss the term “source” in a future meeting to ensure that there is shared meaning on the term and that there is clarity on it’s use. *(ideas for language alternatives were shared via email communications and language was modified for the TIC focus group recommendations presented at the 9 May 2006 meeting.*
11. Focus groups will continue to meet to provide proposed recommendations for the 11 April meeting. *(done and will be continued)*
12. Central Valley Water Board staff will provide comments regarding the TIC Recommendation #1 at the 9 May 2006 TIC meeting. If there are questions or concerns from staff regarding the recommendation they can be discussed at that time. *(This was completed at the 13 June 2006 meeting)*
13. Central Valley Water Board Staff will re-introduce to the TIC the objectives behind the requirement for utilizing a SWAMP comparable format at the 9 May meeting. *(This did not occur, due to lack of time availability. The discussion will occur at a later date).*
14. Stephen Clark will work with the Laboratory Round Table to provide a comparison of the types of entries required by the SWAMP comparable database with a minimal submittal that might be considered necessary for compliance evaluation with the ILP. Real world examples of data entries will be used to the extent feasible. *This was completed at the 13 June 2006 meeting.*
15. Comments received on Triggers Group Recommendations 2, 3, and 4 will be addressed by the Focus Group, and the revisions will be recirculated to the TIC with the goal of ratifying these Recommendations on 9 May 2006. *(Done)*
16. Triggers Focus Group will consider developing recommendations for the scenario of a failed toxicity test and appropriate follow-up in order to address comments regarding TIC Recommendation #1. *(action still pending)*
17. Triggers Focus Group will work on minor language changes to the Recommendations #2-4, for which there was agreement by the TIC to forward them to Water Board staff.

18. FG Recommendation #5 (appended to these meeting notes) discussions will continue, with consideration for agreement, at the 13 June TIC meeting
19. FG Recommendation #6 will be routed to the entire TIC by email to see if any comments are made. If only minor changes are requested or suggested, the recommendation will be forwarded to Water Board staff as a comment to the tentative Conditional Waiver documents.
20. Sediment Toxicity Focus Group Recommendation #1 was presented at the 13 June 2006 meeting, for approval by the TIC.
21. TIC members should reviewed the Triggers Focus Group Recommendation #5 at the 11 July meeting and agreed that it be used as a recommendation to Water Board staff.
22. The CVRWQCB staff did solicit comments from various programs at the CVRWQCB regarding Triggers Focus Group Recommendations 2-5, and for Sediment Toxicity Focus Group Recommendation #1. These were presented at the 11 July 2006 meeting.